

1 KEKER, VAN NEST & PETERS LLP  
2 ELLIOT R. PETERS #158708  
3 epeters@keker.com  
4 ERIC H. MACMICHAEL #231697  
5 emacmichael@keker.com  
6 BAILEY W. HEAPS #295870  
7 bheaps@keker.com  
8 DEEVA SHAH #319937  
9 dshah@keker.com  
10 633 Battery Street  
11 San Francisco, CA 94111-1809  
12 Telephone: 415 391 5400  
13 Facsimile: 415 397 7188

14 Attorneys for Defendants  
15 NIXON PEABODY, LLP and  
16 FORREST DAVID MILDER

17  
18 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
19 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

20 SOLARMORE MANAGEMENT  
21 SERVICES, INC., a California  
22 corporation; CARL AND BARBARA  
23 JANSEN, a married couple,

24 Plaintiffs,

25 v.

26 NIXON PEABODY, LLP, a New York  
27 limited liability partnership; FORREST  
28 DAVID MILDER, a married individual,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:20-cv-10111 CAS JEM

**DEFENDANTS' NOTICE OF  
MOTION AND MOTION TO  
TRANSFER VENUE PURSUANT TO  
28 U.S.C. § 1404(A)**

Date: December 21, 2020

Time: 10:00 AM

Ctrm: 8D

Judge: Hon. Christina A. Snyder

Date Filed November 3, 2020

## 1 **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
3 NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO TRANSFER VENUE .....	6
4 I. INTRODUCTION.....	7
5 II. BACKGROUND.....	8
6     A. DC Solar commits fraud. .....	8
7     B. DC Solar declares bankruptcy. .....	9
8     C. Solarmore brings suit against DC Solar's bankruptcy estate 9     and <i>most</i> of DC Solar's professional advisors.....	9
9 III. ARGUMENT .....	11
10     A. Venue is proper in the Eastern District of California. ....	12
11     B. Transfer will promote the interests of justice. ....	14
12     C. The parties' private interests also weigh in favor of transfer. ....	16
13         1. The contacts with the forum weigh in favor of transfer.....	17
14         2. The availability of witnesses, access to sources of 15             proof, and convenience of the parties favor transfer.....	18
16         3. The cost of litigation favors transfer. ....	18
17         4. Any indication of forum shopping weighs in favor of 18             transfer. ....	19
19 IV. CONCLUSION .....	19

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)	
3	<b>Federal Cases</b>
4	
5	<i>Alec L. v. Jackson</i> , 2011 WL 8583134 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 6, 2011) ..... 7
6	
7	<i>Amazon.com v. Cendant Corp.</i> , 404 F. Supp. 2d 1256..... 11, 13
8	
9	<i>Callaway Golf Co. v. Corp. Trade, Inc.</i> , No. 09-cv-384, 2010 WL 743829 (S.D. Cal. Mar. 1, 2010)..... 14
10	
11	<i>Comptroller v. Calhoun First Nat'l Bank</i> , 626 F. Supp. 137 (D.D.C. 1985) ..... 15
12	
13	<i>D2L Ltd. v. Blackboard, Inc.</i> , 671 F. Supp. 2d 768 (D. Md. 2009) ..... 15
14	
15	<i>In re Double Jump</i> , No. 19-50102-gs (D. Nev. Bkr. 2019)..... 8, 9
16	
17	<i>Friedman v. PopSugar, Inc.</i> , No. 18-CV-05888-CAS, 2018 WL 6016963 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 29, 2018)..... 15, 17
18	
19	<i>United States ex rel. Hallstrom v. Orexis, LLC</i> , 2011 WL 13227859 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 29, 2011)..... 11, 16
20	
21	<i>Hawkins v. Gerber Prod. Co.</i> , 924 F. Supp. 2d 1208 (S.D. Cal. 2013) ..... 10
22	
23	<i>Jolly v. Purdue Pharma L.P.</i> , 2005 WL 2439197 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 28, 2005) ..... 13
24	
25	<i>Jones v. GNC Franchising, Inc.</i> , 211 F.3d 495 (9th Cir. 2000) ..... 15, 16
26	
27	<i>Lou v. Belzberg</i> , 834 F.2d 730 (9th Cir. 1987) ..... 16, 18

1	<i>Madani v. Shell Oil Co.</i> , No. C07-04296 MJJ, 2008 WL 268986 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 30, 2008).....	13
3	<i>Morgan Tire of Sacramento, Inc. v. Goodyear Tire &amp; Rubber Co.</i> , 60 F. Supp. 3d 1109 (E.D. Cal. 2014).....	11
5	<i>Norwood v. Kirkpatrick</i> , 349 U.S. 29 (1955) .....	10
7	<i>Pueblo v. Nat'l Indian Gaming Comm'n</i> , 731 F. Supp. 2d 36 (D.D.C. 2010) .....	14
9	<i>Rubio v. Monsanto Co.</i> , 181 F. Supp. 3d 746 (C.D. Cal. 2016).....	10, 16
11	<i>SEC v. Carpoff</i> , 20-cv-00180-JAM-AC (E.D. Cal.).....	8, 12
13	<i>Shelby v. Factory Five Racing, Inc.</i> , 2009 WL 481555 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 23, 2009) .....	14, 15
15	<i>Solarmore Mgmt. Svc., Inc. v. Bankr. Est. of DC Solar Sols., Inc.</i> , No. 2:19-cv-02544-JAM-DB (E.D. Cal. filed Dec. 17, 2019) (Mendez, J.) .....	9, 14
17	<i>United States v. Alan Hansen</i> , 20-cr-00016-JAM-1 (E.D. Cal) .....	8
19	<i>United States v. Jeff Carpoff</i> , 20-cr-00017-JAM-1 (E.D. Cal.) .....	8
21	<i>United States v. Joseph Bayliss</i> , 19-cr-00182-JAM-2 (E.D. Cal.) .....	8
23	<i>United States v. Paulette Carpoff</i> , 20-cr-00018-JAM-1 (E.D. Cal.) .....	8
25	<i>United States v. Robert Karmann</i> , 19-cr-00222-JAM-1 (E.D. Cal.) .....	8
27	<i>United States v. Ronald Roach</i> , 19-cr-00182-JAM-1 (E.D. Cal.) .....	8
29	<i>United States v. Ryan Guidry</i> , 20-cr-00003-JAM-1 (E.D. Cal.) .....	8

1	<i>Williams v. Bowman</i> , 157 F. Supp. 2d 1103 (N.D. Cal. 2001) .....	18
3	<i>Wireless Consumers All., Inc. v. T-Mobile USA, Inc.</i> , 2003 WL 22387598 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 14, 2003).....	18

5 **Federal Statutes**

6	28 U.S.C. § 157.....	10, 13
7	28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).....	11
8	28 U.S.C. § 1404.....	<i>passim</i>

9 **Rules**

10	Local Rule 7-3 .....	5
12	Local Rule 123.....	7

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1  
2       **NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO TRANSFER VENUE**  
3

4       TO ALL PARTIES AND TO THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD:  
5

6       PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on December 21, 2020 at 10:00 A.M., or as  
7       soon thereafter as the Court directs, Defendants Nixon Peabody LLP and Forrest  
8       David Milder move the Court to transfer this action to the Eastern District of  
9       California.  
10

11       Defendants move to transfer pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404. This Court  
12       should transfer venue to the Eastern District because (1) Plaintiffs could have  
13       brought this case in the Eastern District; (2) nine criminal and civil cases based on  
14       the same facts have concluded or are pending in the Eastern District; (3) one of  
15       those cases has the same plaintiff, involves the same 20 funds, and will require  
16       similar factual and legal determinations; (4) the federal judge who knows the facts  
17       and would preside over these very similar issues is in the Eastern District; and  
18       (5) the conduct at issue happened in the Eastern District. This motion is based on  
19       this Notice of Motion and Motion, the following Memorandum of Points and  
20       Authorities, Defendants' Request for Judicial Notice, all files and records in this  
21       action, and such additional matters as may be judicially noticed by the Court or may  
22       come before the Court prior to a hearing, if any, on this matter

23       This motion is made following a Local Rule 7-3 conference, which took  
24       place on October 21, 2020.  
25

26       Dated: November 20, 2020

27       KEKER, VAN NEST & PETERS LLP

28       By: */s/ Eric MacMichael*  
29                    ELLIOT R. PETERS  
30                    ERIC H. MACMICHAEL  
31                    BAILEY W. HEAPS  
32                    DEEVA SHAH

33       Attorneys for Defendants  
34                    NIXON PEABODY, LLP and  
35                    FORREST DAVID MILDER  
36

1      **I. INTRODUCTION**

2      Plaintiffs Solarmore and Carl and Barbara Jansen (collectively, “Solarmore”)  
3      allege that they were the victims of a complex, long-term tax fraud perpetrated by  
4      non-party DC Solar. Starting in 2010, DC Solar created investment funds to sell  
5      mobile solar generators to investors, who would receive corresponding tax benefits.  
6      Solarmore managed at least 20 of these investment funds over the next eight years.  
7      But in 2018, DC Solar’s principal employees were charged with wire fraud and  
8      money laundering. Seven high-ranking DC Solar employees admitted to operating  
9      a tax-credit Ponzi scheme and pleaded guilty in the Eastern District of California  
10     before Judge John A. Mendez. The SEC filed a civil suit against the owners of DC  
11     Solar, which was also before Judge Mendez in the Eastern District. Eventually,  
12     Plaintiff Solarmore also filed suit in the Eastern District of California before Judge  
13     Mendez. That case, *Solarmore I*, contained numerous allegations against over 30  
14     entities—including professional appraisers, brokers, accountants, tax service  
15     providers, and bankers—that Solarmore believed had aided and abetted DC Solar’s  
16     fraud in 20 distinct investment funds. *Solarmore I*, which is still ongoing, involves  
17     every major professional advisor to DC Solar *except one*: Nixon Peabody LLP.

18     Inexplicably, months after filing *Solarmore I* in the Eastern District,  
19     Solarmore sued Defendants Nixon Peabody LLP and its partner Forrest David  
20     Milder (collectively, “Nixon Peabody”) in Los Angeles. This one-off case,  
21     *Solarmore II*, involves the same 20 investment funds as *Solarmore I*. *Solarmore II*  
22     also parrots many of the allegations in *Solarmore I* verbatim. Nevertheless,  
23     although Judge Mendez has presided over **nine** cases involving the same facts and  
24     even the same parties, Solarmore seeks to have another judge in another court learn  
25     the complexities of this massive fraud scheme. If this case had been brought in the  
26     Eastern District of California, it would have immediately triggered a notice-of-  
27     related-case and a transfer to Judge Mendez. But because *Solarmore II* is before  
28     this Court, § 1404(a) governs and compels a transfer to the Eastern District instead,

1 based on the following indisputable facts:

- 2 • Solarmore could have brought this case in the Eastern District.
- 3 • Nine criminal and civil cases based on the same facts have concluded or are
- 4 pending in the Eastern District. These cases include *Solarmore I*, which has
- 5 the same plaintiff, involves the same 20 funds, and will require similar
- 6 factual and legal determinations.
- 7 • The federal judge who knows the facts and will preside over the very issues
- 8 presented in *Solarmore I* and *Solarmore II* is in the Eastern District.
- 9 • Per Solarmore's own admission, the conduct at issue happened in the Eastern
- 10 District.

11 *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a). This Court should transfer *Solarmore II* to the Eastern  
12 District of California to promote judicial economy, conserve resources, and  
13 minimize the possibility of inconsistent rulings.<sup>1</sup>

## 14 **II. BACKGROUND**

### 15 **A. DC Solar commits fraud.**

16 DC Solar was founded in 2009 and, for nearly all of its existence, operated in  
17 the Eastern District of California. *See* Dkt. 1-2 at ¶¶ 14-16 (“*Solarmore II*  
18 *Compl.*”). DC Solar’s business model entailed creating investment funds to sell  
19 mobile solar generators to sophisticated investors, who would receive substantial  
20 tax benefits from their investment. *See id.* ¶¶ Preliminary Statement, 22, 26-27, 40-  
21 41. DC Solar would then lease the generators from the investment funds and to  
22 third parties, like arenas and concert venues, from whom DC Solar would collect  
23 lease payments. *Id.* ¶ 22. DC Solar created Solarmore to serve as the managing  
24 member of at least 20 of its investment funds. *See id.* ¶ 23. Plaintiff Carl Jansen

25  
26 <sup>1</sup> Should this case be transferred to the Eastern District, Nixon Peabody will  
27 immediately file a Notice of Related Case, pursuant to Eastern District of California  
28 Local Rule 123, to relate this case to *Solarmore I*. Second, this motion is  
independent of Nixon Peabody’s responsive motions, due on December 11, 2020.  
*Alec L. v. Jackson*, 2011 WL 8583134, at \*1 n.1 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 6, 2011) (holding  
that a party may bring a motion under § 1404(a) at any time).

1 was recruited to hold a membership interest in Solarmore. *Id.* ¶ 21. DC Solar also  
2 retained Nixon Peabody and Milder for the limited purpose of providing an opinion  
3 explaining the tax consequence for investors. *Id.* ¶ 29.

4 DC Solar's enterprise collapsed in December 2018 when the FBI raided the  
5 company's headquarters. *Id.* ¶ 105. Most high-ranking DC Solar employees have  
6 since pleaded guilty to wire fraud, money laundering, and similar charges. *See,*  
7 *e.g.*, Dkt. No. 10, *United States v. Jeff Carpoff*, No. 2:20-cr-00017-JAM (E.D.  
8 Cal.). Each of these prosecutions occurred in the Eastern District of California  
9 before Judge Mendez. The prosecutions arising out of DC Solar's fraud include:

- 10 • *United States v. Jeff Carpoff*, 20-cr-00017-JAM-1 (E.D. Cal.)
- 11 • *United States v. Paulette Carpoff*, 20-cr-00018-JAM-1 (E.D. Cal.)
- 12 • *United States v. Ronald Roach*, 19-cr-00182-JAM-1 (E.D. Cal.)
- 13 • *United States v. Joseph Bayliss*, 19-cr-00182-JAM-2 (E.D. Cal.)
- 14 • *United States v. Robert Karmann*, 19-cr-00222-JAM-1 (E.D. Cal.)
- 15 • *United States v. Ryan Guidry*, 20-cr-00003-JAM-1 (E.D. Cal.)
- 16 • *United States v. Alan Hansen*, 20-cr-00016-JAM-1 (E.D. Cal)

17 Relatedly, the SEC also litigated its civil action against the owners of DC Solar  
18 before Judge Mendez in the Eastern District. *See SEC v. Carpoff*, 20-cv-00180-  
19 JAM-AC (E.D. Cal.).

20 **B. DC Solar declares bankruptcy.**

21 Shortly after the FBI raid, the DC Solar entities began filing for bankruptcy  
22 in the District of Nevada. Compl. ¶¶ 107-108. The proceedings have since been  
23 consolidated and converted from Chapter 11 to Chapter 7. *See* Dkt. Nos. 390, 439,  
24 *In re Double Jump*, No. 19-50102-gs (D. Nev. Bkr. 2019).

25 **C. Solarmore brings suit against DC Solar's bankruptcy estate and  
26 most of DC Solar's professional advisors.**

27 In late December 2019, Solarmore sought and received permission from the  
28 District of Nevada Bankruptcy Court to sue the DC Solar bankruptcy estate and the  
other entities it believed had caused it harm. *See* Req. for Judicial Notice in Supp.

1 of Motion to Transfer (“RJN”) Exs. 2, 3 (Dkt. Nos. 1483, 1487, *In re Double Jump*,  
2 *Inc.*, No. 19-50102-gs (Bankr. D. Nev.)). Solarmore then filed suit in the Eastern  
3 District of California before Judge Mendez, the same judge who had presided over  
4 the DC Solar criminal and SEC proceedings described above. *See* RJN Ex. 1  
5 (*Solarmore Mgmt. Svc., Inc. v. Bankr. Est. of DC Solar Sols., Inc.* (“*Solarmore I*”)),  
6 No. 2:19-cv-02544-JAM-DB (E.D. Cal. filed Dec. 17, 2019) (Mendez, J.)).  
7 Solarmore stated that venue was “proper in [the Eastern District] . . . because a  
8 substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to [Solarmore’s] claims  
9 occurred in Benicia, California, which is located in this judicial district.” *Id.* Dkt.  
10 No. 1 ¶ 78. The relevant events were the creation of the 20 investment funds that  
11 Solarmore had managed.

12 In *Solarmore I*, Solarmore sued two sets of defendants: (1) the “core  
13 defendants,” which include various DC Solar corporate entities, the owners of DC  
14 Solar, and some of their associates, *see id.* ¶¶ 7-24; and (2) various professional  
15 entities—including another fund managing member, appraisers, brokers,  
16 accountants, tax service providers, and bankers—that it believed had aided and  
17 abetted DC Solar’s fraud, *id.* ¶¶ 25-53. The *Solarmore I* complaint referenced  
18 Nixon Peabody and catalogued the role Solarmore believed Nixon Peabody had  
19 played in DC Solar’s operation, but Solarmore elected not to sue Nixon Peabody in  
20 that action, *see id.* ¶¶ 145, 162, 262.

21 Solarmore waited nearly a year before filing this action—repeating many of  
22 the same allegations as it set forth in *Solarmore I*—against Nixon Peabody and  
23 Milder, a tax partner in the firm, in Los Angeles County Superior Court. *See*  
24 *Solarmore II* Compl. Solarmore alleges six California state-law claims against  
25 Nixon Peabody: (1) Breach of Fiduciary Duty; (2) Breach of Contract; (3) Unjust  
26 Enrichment; (4) Negligent Misrepresentation; (5) Legal Malpractice; and (6) Aiding  
27 and Abetting Negligent Misrepresentation. The claims against Nixon Peabody in  
28 *Solarmore II* are based on the same underlying facts and transactions alleged

1 against the other professional advisors in *Solarmore I*. Solarmore has not provided  
2 any explanation for why *Solarmore II* was filed in a state court in Los Angeles and  
3 against only Nixon Peabody, despite containing similar claims to *Solarmore I* and  
4 despite the numerous references to Nixon Peabody in the *Solarmore I* complaint.

5 Nixon Peabody’s counsel accepted service on October 5, 2020. Nixon  
6 Peabody then removed the case to the Central District of California for two reasons.  
7 See Notice of Removal, Dkt. 1. *First*, the case is “related to” DC Solar’s pending  
8 bankruptcy proceeding, although the causes of action here are “non-core.” *Id.*; *see*  
9 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(1). *Second*, Solarmore’s claims, although brought under  
10 California law, place Nixon Peabody’s interpretation and application of the federal  
11 Internal Revenue Code at issue. Notice of Removal, Dkt. 1 ¶¶ 27-28.

12 Now Nixon Peabody asks this Court to transfer the case to the Eastern  
13 District of California.

14 **III. ARGUMENT**

15 “For the convenience of parties and witnesses, in the interest of justice,” this  
16 Court “may transfer any civil action to any other district or division where it might  
17 have been brought.” 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a). “The purpose of section 1404(a) is to  
18 ‘prevent the waste of time, energy, and money to protect litigants, witnesses and the  
19 public against unnecessary inconvenience and expense.’” *Hawkins v. Gerber Prod.*  
20 924 F. Supp. 2d 1208, 1212 (S.D. Cal. 2013) (quoting *Van Dusen v. Barrack*,  
21 376 U.S. 612, 616 (1964)). Courts generally consider the threshold question of  
22 whether venue would be proper in the transferee court; if so, courts then weigh the  
23 “public” interest-of-justice factors and the “private” convenience factors to  
24 determine whether to transfer the litigation. *E.g.*, *id.* at 1213-14; *Rubio v.*  
25 *Monsanto Co.*, 181 F. Supp. 3d 746, 760-67 (C.D. Cal. 2016).

26 Although Nixon Peabody bears the burden of demonstrating that transfer is  
27 proper under Section 1404(a), that burden is substantially less than a transfer under  
28 the doctrine of *forum non conveniens*. *Norwood v. Kirkpatrick*, 349 U.S. 29, 32

1 (1955) (“Congress, by the term ‘for the convenience of parties and witnesses, in the  
2 interest of justice,’ intended to permit courts to grant transfers upon a lesser  
3 showing of inconvenience.”) (citation omitted). When ruling on motions to transfer  
4 based on § 1404(a), “the court may consider undisputed facts outside of the  
5 pleadings.” *Morgan Tire of Sacramento, Inc. v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.*, 60  
6 F. Supp. 3d 1109, 1113 (E.D. Cal. 2014).

7 “The interest of justice factor,” which includes “judicial economy, ‘may be  
8 determinative to a particular transfer motion, even if the convenience of the parties  
9 and witnesses might call for a different result.’” *Amazon.com v. Cendant Corp.*,  
10 404 F. Supp. 2d 1256, 1261 (quoting *Regents of the Univ. of Cal. v. Eli Lilly & Co.*,  
11 119 F.3d 1559, 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1997)). This case should be transferred based on  
12 the “interests of justice” factor alone; however, the other two factors also weigh  
13 heavily in favor of transfer to the Eastern District.

14 **A. Venue is proper in the Eastern District of California.**

15 The first step in the § 1404(a) analysis is to determine whether the case could  
16 have been brought in the transferee forum. *United States ex rel. Hallstrom v.*  
17 *Orexis, LLC*, 2011 WL 13227859, at \*1 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 29, 2011). “A civil action  
18 may be brought in . . . a judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or  
19 omissions giving rise to the claim occurred, or a substantial part of the property that  
20 is the subject of the action is situated.” 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).

21 Here, as Solarmore itself concedes, “a substantial part of the events”  
22 occurred in the Eastern District; therefore, venue is proper in that District. As  
23 Solarmore explicitly stated in *Solarmore I*, venue related to DC Solar’s scheme was  
24 “proper in [the Eastern District] pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2) because a  
25 substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to [Solarmore’s] claims  
26 occurred in Benicia, California, which is located in this judicial district.” *Solarmore*  
27 *I* Compl., RJN Ex. 1 ¶ 78.

28 The exact “events or omissions” that gave rise to Solarmore’s claims in

1 *Solarmore I* also underlie *Solarmore*'s claims in *Solarmore II*. *Solarmore*'s claims  
2 against Nixon Peabody arise from Nixon Peabody's provision of legal opinions  
3 letters to *Solarmore* and DC Solar related to 20 specific investment funds. *See*  
4 *Solarmore II* Compl. ¶ 3 (listing specific funds). *Solarmore*'s lawsuit **against every**  
5 **other defendant** in the Eastern District is predicated on the **same** 20 investment  
6 funds. Moreover, although Nixon Peabody is not a party in *Solarmore I*, Nixon  
7 Peabody and its opinion letters are referenced multiple times in the *Solarmore I*  
8 complaint to explain the structure of those same 20 transactions. *See, e.g.*,  
9 *Solarmore I* Compl., RJN Ex. 1 ¶ 145 ("Nixon Peabody . . . issued tax opinion  
10 letters to Plaintiff Purchasers, and the Funds opining to the valid tax benefits."); ¶  
11 162 (referencing the basic structure of the relevant funds as including "a tax opinion  
12 letter from Nixon."). The factual allegations are also the same: entire portions of the  
13 *Solarmore I* complaint appear verbatim in *Solarmore II*. *Compare, e.g.*, *Solarmore I*  
14 Compl. ¶¶ 289-292 to *Solarmore II* Compl. ¶¶ 99-103 (describing the Solarsense  
15 deal with identical language in both complaints). Both complaints arise from the  
16 same DC Solar transactions and involve many similar—and in some cases the  
17 same—questions of fact and law.

18 *Solarmore* can provide no rationale for why the Eastern District is the proper  
19 venue for *Solarmore I* but not *Solarmore II*.<sup>2</sup> By contrast, the *Solarmore I*  
20 complaint contains no allegations that the underlying transactions took place in the  
21 Central District at all, let alone in any substantial manner. Thus, both cases stem  
22 from the same conduct, which substantially occurred in the Eastern District.  
23 *Solarmore II* could have been brought in the Eastern District.

24 And just as in *Solarmore I*, *Solarmore II*'s claims also could have been  
25

26 <sup>2</sup> Moreover, Judge Mendez also determined the Eastern District was an appropriate  
27 venue for both the criminal matters and the SEC enforcement action arising from  
28 these same transactions. *See, e.g.*, RJN Ex. 4, *SEC v. Carpooff*, 20-cv-00180-JAM-  
AC, Dkt. 1 at ¶ 3 (E.D. Cal. Jan. 24, 2020) (stating venue is proper in the Eastern  
District because the "transactions, acts, practices and courses of conduct  
constituting violations of the federal securities laws occurred within this district").

1 brought in federal district court instead of state court. In *Solarmore I*, filed only  
2 with the Bankruptcy Court’s permission, Solarmore alleges various state law claims  
3 nearly identical to those raised here, like negligence and professional malpractice.  
4 Those claims—against almost all of DC Solar’s professional advisors other than  
5 Nixon Peabody—arise from the same case or controversy as the claims against the  
6 bankruptcy estate. *See Solarmore I* Compl. ¶ 73. And Solarmore asserts that  
7 federal subject matter jurisdiction over *Solarmore I* is proper under 28 U.S.C.  
8 § 157, which addresses federal jurisdiction over “any or all cases under title 11 and  
9 any or all proceedings arising under title 11 or arising in or related to a case under  
10 title 11.” *See id.* ¶ 74. Given the similarity of the claims in the two cases,  
11 Solarmore cannot maintain that this action is any less related to the ongoing  
12 bankruptcy proceeding than *Solarmore I*.

13 Thus, venue is proper in the Eastern District.

14 **B. Transfer will promote the interests of justice.**

15 After determining that venue is proper in the transferee district, the Court  
16 must consider whether transfer will promote the interests of justice. “The question  
17 of which forum will better serve the interest of justice is of predominant importance  
18 on the question of transfer, and the factors involving convenience of parties and  
19 witnesses are in fact subordinate.” *Madani v. Shell Oil Co.*, No. C07-04296 MJJ,  
20 2008 WL 268986, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 30, 2008) (internal quotation marks and  
21 citation omitted). “The pendency of related actions in the transferee forum is a  
22 **significant factor** in considering the interest of justice factor.” *Jolly v. Purdue*  
23 *Pharma L.P.*, 2005 WL 2439197, at \*2 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 28, 2005) (emphasis added)  
24 (citing *A.J. Indus., Inc., v. U.S. Dist. Ct. for the Cent. Dist. of Cal.*, 503 F.2d 384,  
25 389 (9th Cir. 1974)). “Litigation of related claims in the same tribunal is **strongly**  
26 **favored** because it facilitates efficient, economical and expeditious pre-trial  
27 proceedings and discovery and avoid[s] duplicitous litigation and inconsistent  
28 results.” *Amazon.com*, 404 F. Supp. 2d at 1261 (emphasis added) (quoting *Durham*

1 *Prods., Inc.*, 537 F. Supp. at 1243).

2 The pendency of nine related cases—*Solarmore I*, seven DC Solar criminal  
3 cases, and a related SEC civil enforcement action—in the Eastern District strongly  
4 militates in favor of transfer. All nine cases, but especially *Solarmore I*, arise out of  
5 the same nucleus of operative facts that Solarmore alleges here. Because the legal  
6 and factual questions presented in the *Solarmore* cases may overlap, having the  
7 cases assigned to the same judge would “avoid the possibility of inconsistent  
8 judgments.” *Callaway Golf Co. v. Corp. Trade, Inc.*, No. 09-cv-384, 2010 WL  
9 743829, at \*7 (S.D. Cal. Mar. 1, 2010). As the complaint in *Solarmore I* indicates,  
10 Judge Mendez may already have to consider Nixon Peabody’s role to adjudicate  
11 Solarmore’s claims against the other professional defendants involved in the same  
12 20 transactions (and vice versa). Judge Mendez will also have to determine what  
13 Solarmore’s damages are (if any), and whether Solarmore’s claims are barred in  
14 whole or in part by *in pari delicto* or contributory negligence.<sup>3</sup> Solarmore has yet  
15 to proffer any reason why Judge Mendez should not preside over both Solarmore  
16 cases.

17 Judicial economy is also served by the Eastern District’s familiarity with the  
18 parties and underlying facts in this exceedingly complex case. *Shelby v. Factory*  
19 *Five Racing, Inc.*, 2009 WL 481555, at \*4 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 23, 2009) (“The  
20 ‘interests of justice’ are best served by transferring this case to the United States  
21 District Court for the District of Massachusetts, which has already dealt extensively  
22 with this dispute between the parties.”). Even where the legal issues could differ,  
23 the transferee court’s “respective knowledge of the parties and facts is also  
24 relevant.” *Pueblo v. Nat'l Indian Gaming Comm'n*, 731 F. Supp. 2d 36, 40-41

25

---

26 <sup>3</sup> For many of the relevant investment funds, Solarmore was primarily owned by  
27 Jeff Carpooff, the owner of DC Solar who eventually pleaded guilty to wire fraud  
28 and money laundering. The defendants in *Solarmore I* and *II* may both ask the  
Court to address factual and legal questions related to Mr. Carpooff’s—and thus,  
Solarmore’s—involvement with and knowledge of the fraud.

(D.D.C. 2010).<sup>4</sup> Judge Mendez has “already dealt extensively with this dispute” by overseeing **nine** cases against the DC Solar principals. *Shelby*, 2009 WL 481555, at \*4. The seven criminal cases alone span 173 docket entries and have generated seven dispositions from the District Court. Judge Mendez is intimately familiar with the facts surrounding the DC Solar tax-credit scheme. The Eastern District’s experience with each facet of the DC Solar litigation creates a uniquely advantageous position to understand this case.

Thus, the Court should transfer this case to the Eastern District to avoid the “wastefulness of time, energy and money that § 1404(a) was designed to prevent,” “a situation in which two cases involving precisely the same issues are simultaneously pending in different District Courts.” *Friedman v. PopSugar, Inc.*, No. 18-CV-05888-CAS, 2018 WL 6016963, at \*10 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 29, 2018) (quoting *Cont'l Grain Co. v. The FBL*—585, 364 U.S. 19, 26 (1960)).

#### **C. The parties’ private interests also weigh in favor of transfer.**

Although the interests of justice trump the parties’ private interests, the Court may also consider “an ‘individualized, case-by-case consideration of convenience and fairness’” to the parties in analyzing a motion for transfer. *Jones v. GNC Franchising, Inc.*, 211 F.3d 495, 498 (9th Cir. 2000) (citation omitted). In *Jones*, the Ninth Circuit set forth ten factors to consider:

- 20 (1) the location where the relevant agreements were  
21 negotiated and executed; (2) the state that is most familiar  
22 with the governing law; (3) the plaintiff’s choice of forum;  
23 (4) the respective parties’ contacts with the forum; (5) the  
24 contacts relating to the plaintiff’s cause of action in the  
25 chosen forum; (6) the differences in the costs of litigation  
26 in the two forums; (7) the availability of compulsory  
27

28 <sup>4</sup> See also *Comptroller v. Calhoun First Nat'l Bank*, 626 F. Supp. 137, 141 (D.D.C. 1985) (transferring an action to a district which had cases arising from “the same factual underpinning,” even though the actions in the transferee court involved slightly different legal issues); *D2L Ltd. v. Blackboard, Inc.*, 671 F. Supp. 2d 768, 784 (D. Md. 2009) (“Litigation in the same court avoids duplicative litigation when one court has already invested substantial time and energy in the related case.”).

1 process to compel attendance of non-party witnesses; (8)  
2 the ease of access to sources of proof; (9) the presence of  
3 a forum selection clause; and (10) the public policy of the  
forum state.

4 *Hallstrom*, 2011 WL 13227859, at \*1 (summarizing *Jones*, 211 F.3d at 498-99).

5 Many of these factors are archaic in light of technological advances, *see Rubio*, 181  
6 F. Supp. 3d at 764, or irrelevant to the proposed transfer here, *e.g.*, *Jones*, 211 F.3d  
7 at 498-99 (considering which state is most familiar with the governing law).

8 Nevertheless, the relevant factors weigh heavily in favor of transfer.

9 **1. The contacts with the forum weigh in favor of transfer.**

10 Solarmore has had significant contacts with the Eastern District and those  
11 contacts relate directly to their causes of action, far more so than any contacts in the  
12 Central District. The *Solarmore II* complaint alleges that the 20 underlying  
13 transactions may have some tangential relationship to the Central District because  
14 the parties have benefited from doing business in California generally. Outside of  
15 that general statement, the *Solarmore II* complaint lacks any allegation that the  
16 underlying transactions occurred in the Central District.

17 By contrast, and as Solarmore admits in the *Solarmore I* complaint, “a  
18 substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to [Solarmore’s] claims”—the  
19 same 20 underlying transactions—“occurred in Benicia, California” in the Eastern  
20 District. *Solarmore I* Compl. ¶ 78. The “operative facts” did not occur within the  
21 Central District; each transaction substantially took place in the Eastern District,  
22 which is also unsurprisingly where every major criminal proceeding related to this  
23 tax-credit scheme occurred. *Lou v. Belzberg*, 834 F.2d 730, 739 (9th Cir. 1987)  
24 (“[i]f the operative facts have not occurred within the forum and the forum has no  
25 interest in the parties or the subject matter, [Plaintiff’s] choice is entitled only to  
26 minimal consideration.”) (citing *Pac. Car & Foundry Co. v. Pence*, 403 F.2d 949,  
27 954 (9th Cir.1968)). Thus, these factors favor transfer.

2. The availability of witnesses, access to sources of proof, and convenience of the parties favor transfer.

The convenience of the parties also weighs in favor of transfer. Solarmore's California corporate headquarters are in Sacramento, which is in the Eastern District. *See* RJN Ex. 5 (Solarmore Statement of Information, California Secretary of State (Aug. 19, 2020)). Solarmore is also familiar with the Eastern District, which is where Solarmore opted to file *Solarmore I* against over 30 other defendants. Nixon Peabody's counsel is in the Bay Area, which is considerably closer to Sacramento than Los Angeles. And although Solarmore's local counsel is in Los Angeles, Solarmore's primary counsel is in Phoenix, Arizona. The remaining parties also reside out-of-state and are, therefore, neutral. For example, Plaintiffs Carl and Barbara Jansen reside in Illinois and have not provided any connection to Los Angeles. *Solarmore II* Compl. at ¶ 2. Nixon Peabody is headquartered in Boston, Massachusetts, and Defendant Forrest David Milder is a partner in Nixon Peabody's Boston office. Overall, the Eastern District is more convenient for the parties.

Moreover, the majority of the DC Solar witnesses are likely in the Eastern District, where DC Solar was based. These witnesses would be better served by a Sacramento forum than the current Los Angeles forum. The events and transactions described in the *Solarmore II* complaint occurred in the Eastern District. The criminal cases—and the related sources of proof—were in the Eastern District. To the extent Nixon Peabody relies on evidence and testimony from *Solarmore I*, those sources of proof will be more readily accessible in the Eastern District. *See Friedman*, 2018 WL 6016963, at \*10 (“[E]ven the pendency of an action in another district is important because of the positive effects it might have in possible consolidation of discovery and convenience to witnesses and parties.”). These factors heavily favor transfer.

### 3. The cost of litigation favors transfer.

Given the proximity of the witnesses, the Eastern District will likely be a less

1 expensive forum to litigate this matter. More importantly, Judge Mendez is already  
2 familiar with nine other cases related to *Solarmore II*, as well as the underlying  
3 entities and transactions. It will be less time-consuming to familiarize the Court  
4 with the facts and parties involved and avoid the difficulty of trying to coordinate  
5 cases in two different courts. Judicial economy will also reduce costs for the  
6 parties, which supports transfer.

7 **4. Any indication of forum shopping weighs in favor of  
8 transfer.**

9 A significant “factor [under section 1404(a)] is the prevention of forum  
10 shopping.” *Wireless Consumers All., Inc. v. T-Mobile USA, Inc.*, 2003 WL  
11 22387598, at \*5-6 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 14, 2003). “If there is **any indication** that  
12 plaintiff’s choice of forum is the result of forum shopping, plaintiff’s choice will be  
13 accorded little deference.” *Williams v. Bowman*, 157 F. Supp. 2d 1103, 1106 (N.D.  
14 Cal. 2001) (emphasis added). Although courts generally defer to a plaintiff’s choice  
15 of forum, such deference is minimal where the operative facts occurred outside that  
16 forum. *See Lou*, 834 F.2d at 739. Here, rather than filing its claims in the Eastern  
17 District—where the majority of the events occurred, where the seven related  
18 criminal cases and the SEC enforcement action were heard, and where *Solarmore I*  
19 is ongoing, Solarmore inexplicably filed *Solarmore II* in Los Angeles. This factor  
20 also favors transfer to the Eastern District.

21 **IV. CONCLUSION**

22 A court in the Eastern District is already set to consider the *Solarmore I*  
23 claims concerning the same plaintiff and the same transactions as *Solarmore II*.  
24 That court has already presided over nine cases related to the parties and facts  
25 underlying those transactions. The Court should promote judicial economy and  
26 convenience by transferring this case to the Eastern District of California.

Dated: November 17, 2020

## KEKER, VAN NEST & PETERS LLP

By: *s/ Eric MacMichael*  
ELLIOT R. PETERS  
ERIC H. MACMICHAEL  
BAILEY W. HEAPS  
DEEVA SHAH

Attorneys for Defendants  
NIXON PEABODY, LLP and  
FORREST DAVID MILDNER